

**REMARKS**

The undersigned thanks Examiner Sisson for the telephone interviews of July 30 and August 6, 2007. During the interviews, the undersigned discussed the present application and the parent application, Serial No. 10/153,189, which is also being examined by Examiner Sisson. In the parent application, the undersigned had interviewed the Examiner on November 1 and 2, 2006, and subsequently filed a timely Amendment, dated November 2, 2006, in response to the Action of August 2, 2006. The claims in the Amendment filed November 2, 2006, were amended as suggested by the Examiner to overcome the rejections in the Action of August 2, 2006, in the parent application. Thus, Applicants were expecting a Notice of Allowance in response to the Amendment filed November 2, 2006. Unfortunately, due to clerical error by the USPTO, the Amendment of November 2, 2006, was not properly recorded as having been filed and the parent application was deemed to have been amended. Subsequently, Applicants filed a Petition to revive the parent application, which according to the Examiner was the right thing for Applicants to do even though the parent application was incorrectly deemed to have been abandoned.

During the interview of August 6, 2007, the Examiner explained that the Petition to revive the parent application had not yet been acted upon. However, the Examiner explained that he had communicated to his Supervisor, Dr. Ram Shukla, that the decision to abandon the parent application was a clerical error on the part of the USPTO. The undersigned suggested that as the status of the parent application is in a limbo, Applicants would like to transfer all of the claims in the Amendment of November 2, 2006, of the parent application (which were amended as per the Examiner's suggestions) into the present case. The Examiner agreed to enter an Amendment transferring all of the claims in the Amendment of November 2, 2006, of the parent application

into the present case even though the pending Action is final, if the number of new claims added are less than the number of claims being canceled. As 40 new claims have been added, while 45 claims have been canceled, Applicants are filing this response as an Amendment After Final under 37 CFR 1.116 as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants believe that the present Amendment should result in the allowance of the newly added claims as these claims were amended as suggested by the Examiner in the parent application.

At this point, the rejections in the Action of April 23, 2007, are respectfully traversed and are moot in light this Amendment.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By /Raj S. Davé/

Raj S. Davé

Registration No.: 42,465

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorneys/Agents For Intel Corporation